



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

306.13

Ropes
copy 1

306.13

Ropes



Harvard College Library

THE GIFT OF

SAMUEL ABBOTT GREEN, M.D.,

OF BOSTON.

(Class of 1851.)

28 Sept. 1889.

~~111-556~~
Crown

9

A Brief Review of the New Revision.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

MAINE STATE CONFERENCE OF

CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES,

JUNE 16, 1881,

BY

Joseph H. Hardy

REV. CHARLES J. H. ROPES,

BANGOR:

JOHN H. BACON, PRINTER.

1881.

A Brief Review of the New Revision.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

MAINE STATE CONFERENCE OF

CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES,

JUNE 16, 1881,

BY

REV. C. J. H. ROPES,

ELLSWORTH, MAINE.

~~III 5567~~

28 Sept 1859

Gift of

Dr. S. A. Green

Deposited in
ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY

A Brief Review of the New Revision.

It is hard for me to follow the able and eloquent address, to which we have just listened with so much interest and enjoyment; but for this arrangement you must thank the Committee, who assigned the general and popular aspects of the Revision, to a Theological Professor, and the specific and critical estimate of it, to a country pastor, who lives nearly thirty miles from a railroad, and at least as far from a library. It has been said that reading Webster's Dictionary is very interesting, but rather disconnected. What I have to say is very disconnected; I can only hope it may prove interesting.

We are all desirous to approach this New Revision without prejudice, but this is simply impossible. The fact is, each one of us has, in his mind's eye, a Bible of his own, which has never been printed, but which coincides with the Authorized Version wherever our studies have not led us to change. This Bible lives in the memory, round it are clustered innumerable associations, and its very words answer like an echo to anything similar, which we see or hear. And when we read the Revised Version, the words of the old Bible come back to us, perchance in the very tones of our mother's voice, fraught with countless recollections of scenes, and studies, and spiritual experiences, so that perforce we say "the old is better." Moreover each one of us, (ministers all, and not a few among laymen,) has some favorite texts, perhaps some cherished changes, in the Authorized Version. We open the Revision and look for these. If our texts are preserved, our corrections supplied, we like the New Version, but if our favorite texts are spoiled (as we are apt to term it,) and our cherished corrections are neglected, we are inevitably disappointed in the work of the Revisers. To illustrate: a Methodist brother not long ago defended the practice of making no preparation for preaching, with Matt. X. 19 "*Take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak.*" Of course the text refers only to defence before persecutors, not to the pulpit at all. But that brother

nevertheless probably does not favor the Revision which has: "be not anxious *how or what ye shall speak*," especially if his experience is like mine, viz. that the less *thought* given to a subject, the more *anxious* I feel about speaking. But indeed apart from all such ulterior motives, it is not easy to accommodate ourselves at once to such changes as these: "*Be not therefore anxious for the morrow: For the morrow will be anxious for itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.*" [Math. VI. 34.] "*Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be fearful.*" [John XIV. 27] "*Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen.*" [Heb. XI. 1] "*Every scripture inspired of God, is also profitable for teaching.*" [2 Tim. III. 16.] "*With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian.*" [Acts XXVI. 28.] "*In your patience ye shall win your souls.*" [Luke XXI. 19.] "*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.*" [Luke II. 14.]

But there is something vastly more valuable than favorite texts, or dear associations, or æsthetic considerations of any kind, namely truth. We do not go to our Bibles simply to hunt up a motto that will stand at the head of a discourse, nor merely for proof-texts to bolster up our own notions in theology, but to learn God's truth in his self-revelation. We go to the New Testament to learn something of the fulness of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. And whether this New Revision disturbs some old associations or not, whether it "tampers with an English Classic" or not, whether it spoils a few proof-texts or sermon-texts or not, or even wrecks a few sermons built upon the sand, is of infinitesimal importance, compared with the question, whether or not it makes God's truth clearer, and God's will plainer through the scriptures. By the answer to this question the New Revision must stand or fall, and I, for one, have not the faintest doubt that it will stand. We may conceive of a New Testament in a few places better than this, but that is looking forward not back, in the direction of more changes not fewer. Compared with the Authorized Version, no careful student of the Scriptures can for a moment, doubt that the Revised Version is an immense advance, and a vast improvement. It may not be the ideal New Testament of the scholar; that will scarcely be found short of the apostolic autographs, in the original Greek. But it is incontestable that the Revised Version makes a large number of passages clear to the common reader, which were not rightly understood before.

Thus it must always have appeared to the ordinary reader strange

that the Lord had only *a few things* against the church in Thyatira. Now we read: "*But I have this against thee that thou sufferest the woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess*; (Rev. II. 20.) So at 1 Cor. X. 25. 28, the quotation "*The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof*," is used as an argument for two opposite practices, both for eating and not eating meat which might have been offered to idols. In the first case it is perfectly logical—'eat anything, for all is God's,' in the second it is incomprehensible, until we see that the second quotation has no place in the true text.

Again, four times only, in the Authorized New Testament, fasting is mentioned in a commendatory manner, twice (in parallel passages) of the evil spirit, which possessed the demoniac boy whom the disciples could not heal, it is said "*This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting*." [Mat. XVII. 21. Mark IX. 29.] It is said also, that Cornelius had been fasting until the appearance of the angel, [Acts X. 30.], and yet again, Paul recommends inferentially that husbands and wives give themselves to fasting and prayer, [1 Cor. VII. 5.] In all the other passages, where fasting is mentioned, it is merely as an existing practice. Now when we find that in each of these four places *fasting* is omitted in the Revision, we reach the important conclusion that the New Testament nowhere commits itself to even the approval, much less the inculcation of fasting, though written by men who not infrequently practiced it. And once more, how many Christian souls have been in bondage to fear through 1 Cor. XI. 29, whose sting is gone in the Revision: "*For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body*." But the cure of the constant misconception of this chapter, by timid communicants is not complete, unless we adopt the change of the American Revisers in v. 27 of "*unworthily*" to "*in an unworthy manner*," showing that it is not the character of the communicant but the *manner* of the celebration, which is under discussion: "*Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord*."

Such changes commend themselves after a moment's thought, but there are others whose need lies on the surface. The Authorized Version is open to moral criticism in giving a command like: "*Abstain from all appearance of evil*" and is manifestly absurd in statements like: "*supposing that gain is godliness*;" "*the love of money is the root of all evil*;" "*the beast that was and is not, and yet is*." So that it is no small relief to

read in the Revision. "*Abstain from every form of evil,*" [1 Thess. V. 22.] "*supposing that godliness is a way of gain,*" [1 Tim. VI. 5.] *the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil.*" [1 Tim. VI. 10.] "*the beast how that he was, and is not, and shall come.*" [Rev. XVII. 8.]

The dramatic vividness of other passages in the Revised Version, stamps them at once as original readings: "*With freedom* [Am. Revisers, better, *For freedom*] *did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage*" [Gal. V. 1.] So the Pharisees' plea in behalf of Paul: "*We find no evil in this man: and what if a spirit hath spoken to him or an angel?*" [Acts XXIII. 9.], and Christ's answer to the father of the demoniac boy, who had said: [Mark IX. 22, 23] "*but if thou canst do anything, have compassion on us and help us.*" "*And Jesus said unto him, If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth.*" i. e. it is not a question of *my* power of authority, but of *your* strength of faith. And so in the parable of the ten virgins: "*But at midnight there is a cry, Behold the bridegroom! Come ye forth to meet him.*" [Matt. XXV. 6.] In these cases the additions made in the A. V. may be termed, as Rev. A. L. Park, I think, happily characterized its italics: "*dashes of water in the sincere milk of the word.*"

It is wonderful what mischief the mistranslation of a single word may do. We have two salient instances of this in Revelation, representing two of the worst faults of the Authorized Version. It translates two entirely different Greek words by the same English word, and so hides the difference between the *four living creatures* which surround the throne of God, and *the beast*, who is cast into the bottomless pit. And then the Authorized Version translates the word *throne*, sometimes *throne*, sometimes *seat*, thus completely obscuring the fulfilment of John's vision of the promise of Christ to his apostles, that they should sit on *thrones*, and also concealing the fact that Satan's Kingdom with its *throne*, is a hellish parody of God's. Some texts in the Authorized Version, either from wrong text, or wrong translation, fail to harmonize with the analogy of faith, and so become real blemishes. Thus "*Blessed are they that do his commandments that they may have right to the tree of life*; [Rev. XXII. 14.] looks as if we were capable of earning the privileges of heaven "*by works of righteousness which we have done.*" But the Revision corrects this: "*Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life.*" This is a change of *text*, but it was an inexcusable blunder which the Revisers

of 1611 made in following the Vulgate [John X. 16]—"there shall be one fold and one shepherd." The *fold* is the church. Christ did not say that all his sheep should be gathered into one church. What He did say reads now: "*And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.*"

It is interesting to notice how so slight a change as that from the indefinite to the definite article modifies the sense of a passage. Thus "*this shall be a sign unto you, ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes,*" [Luke II. 12] makes the swaddling clothes *a* sign that the angel had spoken the truth. But the true reading: "*this is the sign unto you; Ye shall find a babe wrapped in swaddling clothes,*" rightly makes the finding of a new-born babe *the* token by which the shepherds should know that they had found the Christ. So when we read that "*the herd of swine rushed down the steep into the lake*" [Luke VIII. 33] we recognize that *the steep* was a well known feature of the shore at that point. And learning that during the storm Jesus was asleep on *the cushion*, [Mark IV. 38.] we realize that the steersman's leather seat, which was in every boat, formed the hard pillow of him who had not where to lay his head. Six times in Acts, [Acts IX. 2, XIX. 9, 23, XXII. 4, XXIV. 14, 22.] Christianity is called "*the Way*" in probable allusion to Christ's own words [John XIV. 6.] but every one of these references is obscured in the Authorized Version, by translating the definite article "*this*" or "*that.*" When Abraham is said to have "*looked for a city which hath foundations*" [Heb. XI. 10.] one wonders what city is without them; but read it as it should be read: "*he looked for the city which hath the foundations,*" and we recognize at once that this is *the* city of God, of which the Psalmist sang "*His foundation is in the holy mountains,*" [Ps. LXXXVII. 1.] and which the seer beheld with its twelve foundations, each a precious stone [Rev. XXI. 19.]

Take the opposite error. Paul's speech on the Areopagus would have been illogical if the inscription on the altar had been "*to THE unknown God*," [Acts. XVII. 23.] His plea was 'that of which you are ignorant I proclaim, that which you feel after indefinitely, I declare definitely'; and the argument requires for its starting-point an altar inscribed *to AN unknown God*. When the disciples returned to Jesus at the well of Sychar "*they marvelled that he talked with the woman*" [John IV. 27.] I asked an intelligent and scholarly Christian man recently what caused the wonder of the disciples. Said he: "*the nationality of the woman.*"

"No," said I, "it is true Jews *had no dealings with Samaritans*, such as giving or asking favors, but that does not mean that they did not speak to one another." "Then," said he, "it was her character." What did they know about that?" I replied. "Give it up," said he. Then I read the verse in the Revision. "*And upon this came his disciples; and they marvelled that he was speaking with a woman.*" and he saw that it was her sex, not her nationality or her character which excited that wonder of the disciples. It was utterly against all Jewish etiquette for a Rabbi to talk in public with, much less instruct a woman. [Geikie's Life of Christ, I, C. XXXI., Farrar's, I, C. XV.] The disciples had probably never seen Jesus speak to a woman in public, except his mother. See what a flood of light such a text pours upon the whole influence of Jesus upon the sphere of woman, and the complete originality and utter breaking with his age and its customs, which characterized many episodes of his life.

Indeed the very printing of the new Revision makes important additions to our knowledge of the connections of verses hitherto separate. For instance, how much plainer is "*I am the good shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father;*" [John X. 14, 15], than "*I am the Good Shepherd and know my sheep and am known of mine*" 15. "*As the Father knoweth me even so know I the Father,*" (this last indeed would be an entirely irrelevant statement). So in Luke XIII. 24, 25. How clear is now the correction: "*Strive to enter in by the the narrow door: for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord open to us.*"

I must leave this part of the subject thus almost untouched, but cannot close without a brief reference to the omissions and the doctrines of the new Version. I should not wonder if the Revision were a hundred verses shorter than the Authorized Version, but most of these omissions are in parallel passages so that we now simply have the verse *once*, instead of two or three times in the New Testament. The history of the woman taken in adultery, [John VII. 53-VIII. 11.] was not, it appears, written by John, but was not improbably a very early traditional illustration of John VIII. 15, "*Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man.*", and from the margin crept into the text. There is however no reason to doubt its being a faithful record of an actual occurrence. Its style is the farthest possible removed from that of the Apocryphal gospels and similar writings. So the end of Mark's

gospel [Mark XVI, 9-20] was not, it would seem, written by Mark, though there is no other reason to reject it. But why did Mark break off so abruptly? Why did Nicholas of Hereford, Wyclif's co-translator, end his translation of the Old Testament at Baruch III. 20 in the middle of a sentence? Because the hand of persecution was laid upon him. The same or some similar cause, may have stayed the hand of Mark. The authority and canonicity of a scripture are often entirely independent of the question, who wrote it. Witness the Epistle to the Hebrews!

Part of the third and the fourth verses of John V, we may well rejoice to be rid of, as it speaks of the troubling of the water by an angel, and the healing of the first who stepped in, of any and every disease, which he might have. This does not sound like anything else in the New Testament, and was probably nothing but the traditional explanation of the phenomenon of an intermittent or syphon spring, possessing medicinal properties. We should be sorry to make John responsible for it. The Lord's Prayer still remains, and there I shall very possibly horrify some conservatives by the belief which I hold, that it needs but one change to make it perfect—"Bring us not into trial"—not *temptation*, for God does not *tempt* any, in the modern meaning of the word, that is, to evil. It needs no words to show how much more forcible is the prayer for deliverance from *the evil one*, than from *evil*; (notice also in this connection other passages in which the personal source of evil, comes into view in the Revised Version, Matt. V. 37, 2 Thess. III. 3, John XVII. 15, &c.; nor the petition for forgiveness when we are able to say that *we also have forgiven* our debtors. But "Spare us the doxology!" cry the would-be critics from Talmage up. Spare the doxology,—for what purpose? Why, in praying the prayer. Certainly, we are just as free to do that as we ever were; just as free as the Episcopalians are to sing or say the Gloria at the end of each of the Psalms. The liturgical form and the Biblical form of passages may differ very much. And in the use of the Lord's Prayer as a prayer, there is not the slightest objection to the addition of the doxology. But to put it into the VIth of Matthew, and thus to assert that Jesus spoke it as a part of the model prayer, would in the present state of the evidence be simply *telling a lie*. Take a parallel case. The "*Gloria in Excelsis*" begins, as is well known, with quoting Luke II. 14, and continues in words added thereto by Hilary of Poitiers and others. Now it is just as absurd to ask us, in the face of the evidence, to put the doxology of the Lord's Prayer into the text of Matthew, as it would be

to ask that the rest of the *Gloria in Excelsis* might be interpolated after Luke II. 14 in that Gospel. The only difference arises from the fact that the doxology found a place in the old Bible. But that raises the question, which is the *old* Bible? Is it the bible of Beza or of Irenaeus, is it the bible of Erasmus or of Origen. Are its sources a thirteenth century Codex Baziliensis, and Codex Reuchlin, or a fourth century Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Vaticanus. We want the New Testament of Christ's disciples, and in this New Revision we have that water of life dipped up clear and sparkling in the fourth century before it had become dimmed with margins and comments, and mistakes and changes. This is our old Bible—the Authorized Version is the innovator, and it is the Revisers of 1881 who are the wise conservatives.

And now after all, among all the causes for thankfulness, surely not the least is this, that Evangelical Christianity has not for a moment been resting on a mistake. If any Samson of a text has fallen, no pillar of the house has been felled. In all these changes not one doctrine is disturbed, not one duty shaken. The Authorized Version is good enough to live by, good enough to die by, and the Revised Version shows the same road to heaven by the way of the Cross. Thus the question comes up, Are the doctrines changed? Those fixed stars of the scripture firmament shine on, not only undimmed, but even with increased lustre. I have time only to speak of one: the Deity of Christ. It is said that some of the Unitarians are rejoicing in the New Revision because it favors them. What is meant I suppose is that one or two texts like 1 John V. 7, 1 Tim. III. 16, no longer witness to the Deity of Christ; the former verse is spurious, the latter now reads, "*great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh, &c., instead of "God was manifested."* For Unitarians to say such changes favor them, except as very slightly affecting the sum total of the evidence, is much like the man who adduced numerous witnesses who *did not* see him commit a crime, to prove that he did not do it. These verses simply do not directly assert the doctrine of Christ's Deity, like ninety-nine out of one hundred of all the verses in the New Testament, but that is entirely different from denying the doctrine. The Lord's Prayer does not assert Christ's Deity, is it therefore any argument against the doctrine? There are two changed verses in the New Revision which any who believe that the evidence of Christ's Deity is weakened would do well to ponder. 1 Peter, III. 15, "*Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord.*" [Authorized Version: "*Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts.*"]

Peter takes these words, as all admit, from Isa. VIII. 13, "*Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself*," thus deliberately applying to Christ a passage originally referring to Jehovah, and implying an equal dignity for both. Also notice John V. 18, which now reads: "*Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God.*" This direct assertion of a *unique* relation between Christ and God—"his own Father," with the additional fact, that the Jews understood it as a claim to equality with God, so that such apparent blasphemy made them thirst for his blood—forms a text which seems difficult to set aside with perfect candor.

Having thus touched upon our reasons for the almost unqualified approval of the New Revision, it only remains to add a few words in criticism of it. We are doubly fortunate in having bound up with this book a very careful and critical review of it at the hands of the American Revisers—certainly as able critics as could be found. The Appendix as a whole contains a protest against the ultra-conservatism of the Englishmen, who, in a number of cases there specified, subordinated faithfulness to the Greek, to a desire to change as little as possible. In it are noted archaisms such as *tempt* for *try*; *wist*, *wot*, for *know*; *which* for *who*; and *hale* for *drag*, [*"lest haply he hale thee to the judge,"* [Luke, XII. 58,]—I asked an intelligent man what that "*hale*" meant—and he said "a judicial summons." *Holy Ghost* also is an archaism, which considering the modern degrading, superstitious associations with the word *Ghost*, undoubtedly ought to give way to *Holy Spirit*.

The title *Saint*, prefixed to only five books is an absurdity. Is not Paul as much a saint as Mark and Luke? Is John a saint in writing his Gospel, even "*St. John the divine*," [*i. e.* the theologian,] in writing the Apocalypse, but no saint at all in his three Epistles. The writers of the Bible call one another Matthew, Paul, John, &c., we cannot do better than follow their example.

Coming down to specific criticisms it is noticeable that the Revision has made John the Baptist give as the duty of the soldiers who asked him "*what shall we do?*" [Luke, III. 14.] "*Do violence to no man*,"—which sounds an absurd precept for a soldier whose trade is violence. The American Revisers very properly substitute "*Extort from no man by violence.*"

So 1 Cor. XV. 33, they would read "*evil companionships corrupt good morals*," for "*evil company doth corrupt good manners.*" *Manners* in the

sense of *morals*, is a mischievous archaism, and it is not the *company* exactly, but the association with it, *i. e.* the *companionship*, which corrupts. Again, in the definition of faith [Heb. XI. 1] the Americans very properly object that *faith* is not a *proving* of things not seen, but a *conviction* of them.

A large number of the American corrections would simply change the places of text and margin, where the English have adopted more conservative views; but there are two things in which the English can, I believe, be fairly accused of real unfaithfulness to the sense of scripture, and these constitute the heaviest counts of the indictment brought against them by the Americans.

In the opening of Paul's speech to the Athenians [Acts XVII. 23] the Revision reads: "*Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are somewhat superstitious.*" The Americans would say: "*in all things I perceive that ye are very religious,*" and rightly, for Paul was no such fool as to begin by accusing and offending the Athenians with the charge of superstition, especially as that charge would not be borne out by the facts. What Paul proceeds to say shows that he regards the erection of an altar inscribed "TO AN UNKNOWN GOD," as a *religious*, not a *superstitious* act, for he commends it and says that his gospel has come to supplement it: "*What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you.*" It is hard to have Paul's masterly plea disfigured by such a blunder. Unfaithfulness of a different kind is involved in the translation of *denarius* by *penny*:—*shilling* [recommended by the Americans] would have answered every purpose. For example: the good Samaritan is represented as a man of great kindness and liberality, yet he is made to give only *two pence* to provide for the entertainment of the wounded traveler [Luke X. 35] instead of *two shillings*. So the householder, who hired laborers into his vineyard [Matt. XX. 1-16] is represented as giving liberal pay, and as regarding the expectation of some that they would receive more as very unreasonable. It does *not* seem unreasonable, at a *penny* a day, but a *shilling* a day alters the situation. And in a still more important case [Rev. VI. 6.]: "*And I heard as it were a voice in the midst of the four living creatures saying: A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measure of barley for a penny.*" I appeal to any one, if this does not sound like the extreme of cheapness and plenty;—it is intended to convey the idea of famine prices—"A quart of wheat for a shilling and three quarts of barley for a shilling."

But taking the Appendix as a whole, it is by its smallness and comparative insignificance, one of the best possible proofs of the great excellence of the New Version.

And now as a warning to others, I will venture two or three little criticisms of my own. And I wish that one of the Revisers were here, for he could probably expose the fallacy of nearly every point I shall make. Even if they be well taken, they are at most infinitesimal spots on the sun. The word *skandalon* is an awkward word and difficult to translate, yet I cannot help doubting if it needs all those various renderings. "*Occasion of stumbling*," [1 John II. 10] and often; "*Occasion of falling*," [Rom. XIV. 13;] "*Things that cause stumbling*," [Matt. XIII. 41;] "*stumbling-block*," [1 Cor. I. 23] and often; "*offence*," [1 Peter, II. 8, Rom. IX. 33].

So "*broma*" is rendered twelve times *meat* or *meats*, three times *food*, which should be in every place, as *meat* in any other sense than *flesh-meat* is an archaism, while that modern sense is misleading in some passages. Again *poneros* is rendered *evil* and *wicked*, both of which renderings are probably necessary, but can as much be said of the additional renderings, *bad* [Matt. XXII. 10], *harm* [Acts, XXVIII. 21], *grievous* [Rev. XVI. 2], *vile* [Acts, XVII. 5]? I can see no reason why *evil* should not be used in each of these passages. The great fault of the Authorized Version is its abuse of synonyms, and it is one which the Revisers have specially set themselves to correct.

There are a few things in the margin, besides the many to which the Appendix refers, which I should be glad to see in the text, because it seems to me that faithfulness requires it. Only from the margin do we learn, that the traitor Judas in betraying Christ [Matt. XXVI. 49, Mark XIV. 45], and the sinful woman who anointed Christ's feet in the house of Simon the Pharisee [Luke VII. 38, 45], and the father in receiving the penitent prodigal [Luke. XV. 20], and the Ephesian elders in bidding Paul farewell [Acts XX. 37], each *kissed again and again*, [margin—*kissed much*]. I think this graphic touch should be included in the English text as it is in the Greek. So I would read the centurion's exclamation beside the cross [Matt. XXVII. 54, Mark XV. 39], "*Truly this was a Son of God!*", because the Roman heathen might naturally speak of a Son of God, but would hardly have learned to think of any one as occupying pre-eminence as the Son of God, and there is no article in the Greek. Also it seems to me to sweeten the promise with which Matthew's Gospel ends, to give it literally—"lo, I am with you all the days [text, *always*], even unto the end of the world."

Matt. VIII. 20, Luke IX. 59, Christ says: "*The foxes have holes and the birds of the heaven have nests, [margin, lodging-places] but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head.*" Now most birds have nests only for a few weeks in the year, and our Lord is describing more permanent abiding places. He had sometimes a temporary lodging, never a permanent abode. And the Greek contains truer natural history than the English, reading *the birds of the heaven have dwelling places*, which I should like to see in the text. The verse would then more forcibly convey the idea "beasts and birds have homes, Christ has none on earth." The last passage on which I offer a suggestion is Matt. V. 22. "*Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire.*" I would substitute the marginal *Moreh* for "*Thou fool*," for the reason that the English rendering gives no adequate idea of the strength of the original. *Raca* gives an excellent precedent for this course, and if it is wise to retain *Raca* untranslated, it is doubly wise so to leave *Moreh*, because the latter is a much worse expression and is said to merit a far severer penalty. Geikie thus expresses the sense of the verse [Life of Christ II. C. XXXVI]. "Public reproach merits a public penalty, but he who would consign another to hell, is himself in danger of being sent to it." *Moreh* has a Hebrew history. The *Moreh* is the personification of the great sin of the Israelites in the wilderness; the sin which again and again called down upon them swift destruction in earthquake, pestilence, serpents, or flaming fire, from the hand of the Lord; the sin which wore out all the patience of Moses the meekest man, so that he broke forth in anger at Meribah: [Numbers XX. 10] the sin which finally excluded a whole generation of Israel from entrance on the promised land unto whom God "*sware in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest*," the sin of rebellion. "*Thou rebel*" might be a literal translation of *Moreh*, but it would not convey the idea of rebellion against God, and the consequent imprecation of a condemnation like that which overtook the rebels of old. *Thou fool* is evidently so tame a translation as to be really unfaithful, and in the absence of any adequate rendering, it seems best to put *Moreh* into the text, and an explanation with Old Testament references into the margin.

And now in closing, I would earnestly deprecate criticism of the Revision. Do not let us, brethren, have the arrogance to suppose

that we, after a few hours labor, can criticize the work of thirty-seven of the best men in England and America, which has occupied them nearly eleven years. Perhaps I can illustrate our incompetency—if indeed I have not already sufficiently done so—by explaining one passage Luke IX. 32, where I thought I had caught the Revisers, but found myself in the wrong. In Luke's description of the Transfiguration this verse reads: "*Now Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: but when they were fully awake (Margin, having remained awake) they saw his glory and the two men that stood with him.*" I thought—this is another place where the margin ought to take the place of the text, for the usual meaning of the word *diagregorein* is simply *to watch through*. I found Grimm's lexicon, and the commentaries of Meyer, Trench, and Riddle took that side, and further, that Prof. Roberts of the English Revision Committee, had written in his Companion to the Revision, published with the New Version: "This verse is quite misrepresented in the A. V.... It ought to be rendered as in the R. V.... *yet having remained awake they saw his glory*—quoting, you see, as in the text, what stands only in the margin. I thought I had a real correction, but was a little doubtful. So I wrote to one of the Revisers, who settled the question for me. Grimm's lexicon had cited a passage from Herodian, which plainly confirmed his view, and had referred to, without quoting, another passage from Nicephorus of Byzantium, which I could not look up. My friend kindly quotes it from Stephens's Thesaurus, and it appears to warrant the rendering, *when they were fully awake*; the *dia* in *diagregorein* being capable of either the sense *through*, or *thoroughly (thoroughly)* as Winer says, and so the verb has the two meanings *to wake (watch) through*, or *to wake thoroughly*. Now this latter meaning is manifestly (so my correspondent continues) favored by the context, if we note the continuative almost the pluperfect force of *esan bebaremenoi*—(which might almost be translated "*had been heavy with sleep*") and then the pointed instantaneousness of the following aorist with its adversative *de*. (Farrar renders it "suddenly starting into wakefulness." *Camb. Bible for Schools*.) Moreover the context, as Weiss says, (Meyer's Comm. new ed.), seems designed to explain how it was that the disciples only now for the first time came to see Christ's transfiguration and the two men standing near. This is conclusive for the text of the Revision. I adduce all this learning (none of it my own) to warn us that we must dig deep, and read far and wide, before we venture to plume ourselves on correcting the Revisers of 1881.

I will close with two old cautions which have not lost their appropriateness. Lay to heart the words of dear old William Tyndale in the preface to his revised N. T. of 1534: (the spelling is modernized) "If any man find fault either with the translation or ought beside, which is easier for many to do than so well to have translated it themselves, of their own pregnant wits at the beginning without forensample; to the same it shall be lawful to translate it themselves, and to put what they lust thereto." Lay to heart also the story which Isaac Walton tells us: that Dr. Richard Kilbye one of the company of the Revisers of the Authorized Version heard accidentally a young preacher discussing the New Version and giving three reasons why a particular word should have been translated differently. He told him that the Revisers had considered those three reasons and seven more on the same side, but had found thirteen stronger reasons on the other side for translating as they did. The moral of this is too painfully evident to need pointing.—

Thank God for the Revision of 1881!

